

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 and 28-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 12, 13, 28 and 30 are amended. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Woo during the February 2, 2006 personal interview are gratefully appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-22 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed during the personal interview, the claims now recite "an electronic information management system", which is clearly indicative of a physical device. Moreover, the various means claimed in some of the independent claims are also indicative of devices that perform the specific functions claimed, and those devices, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, 6th paragraph, may be construed in light of the specification that is replete with examples of the practical applications of the claimed subject matter.

Finally, it is clearly stated in the "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" that "a finding that a claim fails to recite a computer implemented process is not determinative in whether that claim passes muster under §101. Therefore, USPTO personnel should no longer rely on the machine implemented test to determine whether a claimed invention is directed to statutory subject matter." With respect to the method claims, method steps are directed to specific functions that are to be performed, and are thus clearly not directed to abstract ideas. Thus, claims 1-22 and 28-30

are directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-22 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Huston et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0007402) in view of David (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,902). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an electronic information management system and associated method that includes deleting means for deleting from the storing means via the network and via a deletion method specified by the client unnecessary electronic information, as recited in independent claims 1-3, 12, 13, 28 and 30. Support for this feature can be found in the specification at, for example, page 13, lines 10-14.

Huston teaches managing a content and providing the content to users over a communications link using a differencing engine that is configured to selectively cause content to be refreshed in a cache (Abstract). Moreover, Huston teaches that a traffic server 216 checks a list of authorized users, domains, URLs or IP addresses to determine whether the request is from an authorized user. If so, then the request to delete the content from cache 236 is processed normally (paragraph [0053]). However, as agreed during the personal interview, Huston fails to disclose or suggest that the deletion method is specified by the client, as recited in the independent claims.

David teaches a method for managing documents in a system comprising at least one electronic data processing installation for processing data by means of at least one data bank (Abstract). However, David fails to cure deficiencies in Huston in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of independent claims 1-3, 12, 13, 28 and 30.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1-3, 12, 13, 28 and 30, and their dependent claims, are patentable over the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-22 and 28-30 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tarik M. Nabi
Registration No. 55,478

JAO:TMN/amw

Date: February 6, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--